DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 370 CS 207 786

AUTHOR Haskins, Jack B.
TITLE The Trouble with Bad News.
PUB DATE Jan 81
NOTE 16p.; A more extensive version of this article appeared in the Third Annual Communications Research Symposium: A Proceedings; Joseph P. McKerns, Ed. (Knoxville, TN, College of Communications, 1980).
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Information Analyses (070)
JOURNAL CIT Newspaper Research Journal; v2 n2 p3-16 Jan 1981

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Communication Research; Mass Media Effects; *Media Research; *News Media; *News Reporting
IDENTIFIERS *Audience Response; *Negative News

ABSTRACT

Subjective comments from veteran news reporters, media critics, and the public give the impression that bad or negative news is becoming a major problem in this country. This impression raises major questions concerning how much is really known about bad news, including whether the media present an accurate or distorted picture of reality in portrayals of bad news, how accurate the public's perception is with regard to the amount and prominence of bad news, the effects of bad news, and constructive approaches to the presentation of bad news. A review of psychological and communications research evidence produces some empirical support for the following hypotheses: (1) since 1950 the proportion of bad news in United States media seems remarkably stable, varying between 25% and 50% of total news space, with American television network news programs being the heaviest dealers in bad news; (2) the news media do not reflect the world of real events very faithfully--the more serious crimes are overrepresented; (3) "too much bad news" is the leading public complaint about media news, but since only about one-third of the news is bad, the public undoubtedly misperceives and overestimates the actual amount; (4) interest in bad news, however, averages about one-fourth to one-third higher than for other kinds of news combined; (5) in the short run, even a short radio broadcast can have several undesirable effects, while the long term effects can only be suspected; and (6) happy endings, optimistic titles, and solutions to problems are more interesting than the same bad news items without such positive approaches. (HTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CS 207 786

ED233370

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Newspaper Research Journal

• vol. 2, no. 2 January, 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jack B. Haskins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AJE newspaper division publication

by Jack B. Haskins

The Trouble with Bad News

Author reviews, analyzes what's known about bad news in media, public response to it.

Comments and anecdotal reports from veteran newsmen and media critics leave the impression that bad news is getting to be a major problem in this country. Subjective verification comes in the form of people's immediate reactions when "the bad news problem" is mentioned.

Anecdotes, impressions and random observations are interesting and provocative, and perhaps even necessary to research. But they don't qualify as acceptable evidence. The real question at hand is: What do we *really* know about bad news? How much empirical research has been done on the topic, and what has really been discovered?

This article will review the existing research-based evidence on a possible "bad news" problem as the framework for further research on the topic if justified.

Major Questions About Bad News

Preliminary thinking and investigation leads to formulating a number of general questions that need answering. These also serve as a convenient outline for classifying and reporting results of the search.

1) First, what *is* bad news? An acceptable definition needs to be found, or created, early in the study of the concept.

2) What is the *prevalence* of bad news? Some facts about the sheer quantity of bad news in the various print and broadcast media, in the U.S. and abroad, in the past and the present, will be useful. Along with sheer prevalence, we need to know how *prominently* such news is displayed.

3) Do the media present an accurate or distorted picture of *reality* in portrayals of bad news? This

Dr. Haskins is professor of journalism at the University of Tennessee College of Communications, Knoxville. A more extensive version of this article appeared in the *Third Annual Communications Research Symposium: A Proceedings*, Joseph P. McKerns, ed., (Knoxville, Tenn.: College of Communications, 1980).

requires knowing something about the actual occurrence of events in the real world, against which the media portrayals can be compared.

4) How do the news *gatekeepers* perceive, value and handle bad news? Their criteria of news values, their perceptions of audience interests and their own interests and motives need exploration to understand the bad news phenomenon.

5) Does the public have accurate or distorted *perceptions* of the amount and prominence of bad news in the media? This requires that public perceptions be compared with actual prevalence of bad news in the media.

Perhaps the order of the three preceding questions might be restructured to indicate that the facts about *reality* need to be compared with the facts about *media portrayals of reality*, which in turn need to be compared with *public perceptions of media portrayals of reality*.

6) What is the level of audience *interest* in bad news? Research on interest levels in various kinds of subject matter, on attention and on selective exposure will help answer this question.

7) What are the characteristics of the bad news *audience?* A look at demographic, psychographic and other characteristics of those who are turned on and turned off by bad news can provide portraits for further study and understanding.

8) *Why* are people interested in bad news? This is one of the most intriguing but difficult questions, exploring the paradox of why people are attracted to unpleasant events and news of such events. The "why" question may take the investigator into the rich but tangled psychological landscape of motivations, needs, emotions, instincts and possibly into psychobiology, the study of the neurological centers for pain and pleasure located in the brain.

9) What are the *effects* of bad news? This is certainly one of the most important questions of all. Knowing whether bad news has harmful effects or helpful effects or no effects on individuals, or on society, or on the media themselves, in the short run and in the long run, is undoubtedly crucial information.

10) What are some *constructive approaches* to the presentation of bad news in the media? This is the most practical question of all, from the standpoint of both journalistic practice and social benefits. This assumes, of course, that there are other equally "accurate" ways of depicting bad news that will be better from the standpoints of the media and the public.

In addition to those specific questions, much thought should be given to questions regarding the formulation of hypotheses for further research, priorities for further exploration, and the implications and applications of bad news research to other areas such as public relations, advertising, international communications, political communications, journalism education, etc.

The present paper is an overview of the available evidence on the questions posed.

Definition of Bad News

Two kinds of definitions should be formulated for any investigation of this kind. The investigator should start with some common-sense generally-accepted *concept*, which should then be tested and refined and empirically verified as a scientific *construct*.

Therefore, the study of bad news starts from the common-sense concept or definition of bad news as "new information about events, objects or other referents which are themselves generally considered to be unpleasant or harmful." Note that nothing is said about bad news being *aversive*, since unpleasantness and aversiveness are conceived to be two different dimensions.

Like most concepts we can talk about, the basic meaning of bad news is considered rooted in everyday language and perceptions, the "eye of the beholder."

Further research has shown the common-sense definition of bad news to have an empirical foundation in reality. A factor analysis of the reader interest ratings on a large number of typical newspaper items revealed several categories of bad, good, mixed and neutral items.[1] The "bad news" categories or factors were labelled: "Life-Threatening Mishaps to Individuals;" "International Wars and Disputes;" and "National Economic Troubles and Frauds."

One "good news" factor was found which was labelled "Self-Improvement." There is another interesting set of categories which one might call "constructive approaches to problems" or "bad news with a positive twist." These categories were labelled: "Proposed Solutions for Family Problems" and "Proposed Solutions for Social Problems."

It appears that bad news is not a unitary concept: there are several factors or categories, each consisting of a different kind of bad news. Similar research on a wider range of news items will undoubtedly result in many more categories.

Prevalence and Prominence of Media Bad News

Just how much bad news is carried by the mass media, and how much prominence is it given relative to other kinds of information?

Prevalence. In the 1939-1950 period, bad news comprised at least 14% of text editorial space and about 17% of the pictorial editorial space in 130 daily newspapers.[1]

That is probably a very conservative figure since it includes only those six categories that were entirely bad news (war and defense, fires, disasters, crime and accidents), and does not include scattered bad news items from 34 other categories.

In 1953, the AP and UPI syndicated news wires contained 33% bad news and 39% good news.[2]

In 1961, Michigan daily newspapers contained at least 32% bad news; this, too, may be a conservative estimate since it includes only the all-bad categories and ignores scattered bad news in other categories.[4]

In six major American cities in 1976, at least one-fourth of the front-page photographs dealt with bad news.[5] In 1978, nine Southern California daily newspapers carried 37% bad news and 34% good news.[6]

Turning to television, network evening news contained about one-third bad news in 1970.[7] However, this did vary by network. Another study of TV news that year showed that CBS contained about 50% bad

news, NBC contained about 40%, and the Canadian network contained about 25%, as measured by amount of air time.[8] Even when Vietnam war news was removed, CBS carried twice as much bad news as the Canadian network.

Longitudinal studies of news content reveal considerable variation over time, and different variations for different kinds of bad news. For example, in New York newspapers, the amount of crime news increased sharply from 1950 to 1970, while disaster news declined sharply.[9]

In Knoxville, the ratio of bad and good news fluctuated greatly in the 1893 to 1973 period; there was more bad news than good in 1893, declining to a low point in 1933 when good news predominated, rising again to a high point in 1973 with more than twice as much bad news as good.[10]

Prominence. The term prominence refers to preferential display techniques used in the news media to call attention to certain items—for example, more space or air time, placement on the front page or in the first half of a newscast, bigger headlines, the use of pictures and so forth.

In the 1940s, bad news was more likely than other categories to get photographic coverage in 130 American daily newspapers.[11]

In British newspapers, a two-year study of suicide news revealed that the more violent the suicide, the greater the display in terms of more stories, longer and more prominent headlines.[12]

In Southern California daily newspapers, bad news was more likely to appear on the front page than good news. On the inside pages, good news items outnumbered the bad 37% to 32%; on the front page, bad news outnumbered good by 39% to 32%.[13]

Two studies deal with television news prominence in 1970. On American network TV, bad news was more likely to appear in the first half of broadcast and to get visual emphasis, and was augmented in other ways.[14] On both American and Canadian TV newscasts, news items containing aggression are longer than nonaggression items.[15]

Summary, Prevalence and Prominence. Since 1950, the proportion of bad news in a variety of media, places and times seems remarkably stable, varying between 25 percent and 50 percent of total news content. On the average, about one-third of all editorial content is bad news and about the same proportion can be described as good news.

Though the available data are far from complete, bad news may have been much less prevalent in the 1940s, even including war news, than in more recent years.

There appear to be strong fluctuations over time, with indications of a low ratio of bad news in the early 1930s and an extremely high ratio in the 1970s. American TV networks carry a considerably higher proportion of bad news than does the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Bad news is more likely than other news to get preferential display techniques, in both newspapers and television—the stories are longer, more likely to be portrayed in photographs, more likely to appear on the front page or early in the newscast.

Accuracy of Media Portrayals

Do the news media present a faithful or a distorted picture of events occurring in the real world? Are certain kinds of events disproportionately represented in the news media, compared with their occurrence in reality?

The evidence is meager. Looking at all prime time television content rather than at news, the frequency of various crimes appearing on the tube has been found to have little relationship to their frequency in real life.[16]

An analysis of the three leading news magazines found little relationship between real events and their coverage in the magazines during the 1960s.[17]

More specifically on the topic of bad news, the coverage of crime news by Colorado newspapers bore little relationship to the amount of crime actually occurring in the state.[18] A study of Houston newspapers revealed that the more serious crimes were over-reported and the less serious were under-reported;[19] the same article cites another study indicating that the British also over-represent the more serious offenses.

Factual errors are another measure of accuracy. About half of all news stories contain some kind of error.[20] Bad news contains more errors than other news.[21]

Summary of Media Accuracy. The meager amount of evidence available indicates that newsmagazines, newspapers, and TV prime time shows do not reflect the world of real events very faithfully. More specifically, the most serious crimes are probably over-represented in Houston and British newspapers. Bad news is also more likely to contain factual errors than other news.

Journalists News Values

How do the news "gatekeepers" value bad news relative to other kinds of news? Do their interests, perceptions and values match or differ from those of the general public?

The most conclusive behavioral evidence has, of course, already been cited: bad news appears to be overselected from the real world for inclusion in the news media and is displayed more prominently than other news after selection.

First, a look at the general public as gatekeepers for bad news: the evidence is fairly conclusive from a number of experiments that most people are more reluctant to transmit bad news than good news in situations involving person-to-person transmission.[22] This reluctance to transmit bad news is called the MUM effect—people keep Mum on Unpleasant Messages. Gossips and rumor-mongers are apparently exceptions to the rule.

The MUM effect apparently does not hold with journalists, however, possibly due to professional role-playing and the impersonality of media transmission. It is known that, among beginning reporters, an underlying set of news values is pervasive, values derived from colleagues, superiors, financial rewards and journalistic education.[23] These values are part of the "conventional wisdom" of the trade.

Journalism textbooks vary in the explicit importance ascribed to

conflict, violence, sensationalism and other attributes of bad news in relation to their news values. One study on news priorities among newspaper and broadcast editors found that conflict was valued more than either "impact" or "prominence of the principals," and about equally valued with proximity and timeliness.[14] Another study ranked conflict fourth among five major news values.[15]

More to the point, however, is a study of London *Times* editors. When given a choice between more negative or less negative versions of the same news stories, they chose the more negative version by 71% to 16% for one story and by 92% to 1% for another.[16]

Summary of Journalists' Values. Bad news appears to be overselected from the real world for inclusion in the news media and to be given more prominent display after selection. Given a choice between a pair of items on the same topic, London editors will overwhelmingly choose the one with more conflict. This is contrary to a general tendency among the public to be more reluctant to transmit bad news than good news in person-to-person transactions.

The journalists' affinity for bad news probably derives from the conventional wisdom of the trade, being among the high-priority values transmitted implicitly if not explicitly from one generation of newsmen to the next.

Public Perceptions of Media Bad News

Selective attention, selective perception and selective recall are three well-documented principles of audience behavior. How accurately does the public perceive the amount and prominence of bad news in the media?

On a general psychological plane, high-hostility persons will perceive more violence in any given situation than will low-hostility persons.[17] Heavy viewers of violence on television are said to overestimate the actual danger of violence in the real world—a "paranoia" effect.[18] Public opinion about crime is more closely related to crime *news* than to the actual amount of crime.[19]

The best evidence, however, comes from a nationwide random sample of U.S. adults conducted in 1977.[20] People believe television and newspapers bias the news and distort events. More specifically, their leading criticism of newspaper and TV news by far is "too much emphasis on bad news and not enough on the good;" about seven out of ten endorsed that criticism.

Summary of Public Perception. Both the general psychological evidence and specific evidence on news strongly indicate that the public probably overperceives the amount of bad news contained in the mass media.

Interest in Bad News

Is bad news more interesting to the public than good news, as many editors and broadcast journalists seem to think? Does bad news really sell newspapers?

A detailed analysis of available reader interest data has been presented in another paper.[21]

The best evidence available is from a readership summary on 40,000 items from 130 newspapers surveyed in the 1939-1950 period.[22] The average readership of bad news items was 25%, compared with about 20% for all other items including comics (B/G index = 25/20 = 125%). Readership varied in the six bad news categories from 35% for War news, down to 13% for Minor Crimes. The same study showed that pictures containing bad news had higher readership than other pictures, 66% to 49%, a B/G ratio of 135%.

A 1967 study showed that news items containing "high" violence had a reader interest rating of 52 compared with 37 for non-violent items, the B/G index figuring out to 140%.[23]

A 1968 study of teenagers showed a reader interest rating of 64 for "Speed and Violence" articles compared with 49 for all other articles, a B/G ratio of 130%.[24]

A 1972 readership survey of a Tampa newspaper produced 36% readership for the average bad news item, compared with 19% for all other editorial items, a B/G ratio of 190%.[25]

A 1977 study of a High Point newspaper predicted readership figures of 35% for bad news items, compared with about 27% for all other items, a B/G ratio of 130%.[26]

A 1978 study of a Charlotte newspaper predicted an average readership of 24% for bad news compared with about 21% for other items, a B/G ratio of 114%.[27]

A 1978 study in the Knoxville metropolitan area produced "high interest" figures of about 41% for bad news categories compared with about 34% for all other categories, a B/G ratio of 120%.[28]

Less specific results were reported from a Minneapolis readership survey, in which items classified as "unpleasant" had significantly higher average readership percentages than those classified as "pleasant."[29]

A methodological study in 1979 found that constructive approaches or prosocial treatments of bad news were more interesting than straight bad news. The mean reader interest rating for bad news items was 50, for constructive approaches to problems was about 63.[30] An earlier study reached the same general conclusion.[31]

Summary of Audience Interest. The reading public can be aptly described as "bad news bears." Reader interest in bad news averages about one-fourth to one-third higher than for all other kinds of news combined.

Bad news appears to stimulate interest in pictures even more than in article reading. War news appears to be the most interesting type of bad news, while minor crimes and other local bad news trivia are below average in interest.

Interesting though bad news undoubtedly is, compared with most other kinds of news, another category labelled "constructive approaches to bad news" is even more interesting. Pro-social treatments of bad news and proposed solutions to problems appear to fit newspaper readers' definition of the kind of news they want to see more of, "drama with a happy ending," if their interest in newspapers is to be maintained.[32]

Who Needs Bad News?

What are the characteristics of the bad news audience? Is this audience segment typical of the general audience or does it have distinguishing features of a demographic, psychographic or even genetic nature?

The evidence is spotty, not because of a lack of reader interest data but because the existing data have not been broken out by "bad news" and "good news."

In the 1940s, men were generally more interested in bad news than were women.[39] However, recent studies have shown that young women under 35 are more interested than young men, and older men are more interested than older women.[40] [41]

Eysenck's two-factor theory of personality is related to many kinds of behavior.[42] Of his four basic personality types, it is predicted that bad news would be actively sought out by the Neurotic Extrovert and actively avoided by the Neurotic Introvert, while the stable types would be largely indifferent.

Two other personality characteristics that may be associated with higher interest in bad news are dogmatism or "closed-mindedness"[43] and field-independence.[44]

Summary of Audience Characteristics. While men may be more generally interested in bad news than women, the opposite may be the case in the under-35 age group, at least for certain specific types of bad news. Not much else is known at the moment, without further analysis of existing data. However, it is suspected that bad news interest may be associated with low intelligence and with certain personality types.

Motives Behind Bad News Interest

Why do some people avidly seek out bad news and other people avoid it? Why the more general manifestations of morbid curiosity—attendance at horror and disaster movies, the "scare me, daddy" request from tiny children, personal visitation to the scenes of fires and murders and gory accidents?

The question "why" deals with such underlying concepts as personality characteristics, needs, instincts, motives and genetically heritable characteristics. The term "motives" is used here as a general label for all such speculations.

Here there is a great deal of theorizing, little agreement among the theorists and even less direct evidence. Since the present work is primarily a review of available evidence, the relevance of such theories is more appropriate to some other time. However, some theoretical framework is almost certainly crucial to future systematic research.

Effects of Bad News

What are the immediate effects of bad news on those exposed to it? What are the long-range effects of prolonged exposure to bad news over long periods of time, on individuals and on society?

There is a widespread belief among psychologists and psychiatrists that sociocultural forces have a profound influence on mental and emotional health. A recent review concludes, however, that not much is known about just which forces have which effects on which kinds of people.[45] The author concludes that ". . .more specific hypotheses regarding the major relationships (between sociocultural forces and psychopathology) . . ." are needed.

Just such a specific hypothesis is offered here, that prolonged exposure to bad news over long periods can have detrimental effects on moods, attitudes, perceptions and emotional health.

What is already known that might be relevant to the question of bad news effects? Some people appear to have a general affinity for negative information; when equal amounts of positive and negative information are presented on a topic, their judgments will be influenced more by the negative than by the positive information.[46]

A stimulus that is known to be threatening causes less anxiety and is preferred over an unpredictable stimulus that might be either pleasant or unpleasant, i.e., people generally prefer to know the worst rather than just suspect it.[47] People of the type known as "field independent" are likely to acquire paranoid feelings when exposed to threatening or unpleasant information.[48]

Pavlov's experiments showed long ago that reactions to one stimulus can be transferred or conditioned to another stimulus through repeated association. More pertinent to the present topic is the finding that anyone or anything associated with an unpleasant stimulus will also come to be perceived more negatively.[49]

According to public opinion polls, crime is considered a leading social problem, although crime is actually a very rare event statistically, with only one person in a hundred victimized nationally.

It appears that public opinion may be an effect of the amount of crime news rather than of actual criminal activity. The tendency of the public to overestimate a crime varies directly with the seriousness of the crime.[50]

A British psychiatric journal reports a significantly higher suicide rate among men under 45 after suicide news had appeared in British newspapers; another study is cited indicating an increase in suicides after news on the suicides of famous people.[51] In California, automobile deaths were found to increase by one-third shortly after publicized suicides.[52]

"Learned helplessness" is hypothesized by some psychologists as a cause of depression and other emotional dysfunctions. More specifically, television newscasts emphasizing heightened drama, chaos and unpredictability have been hypothesized as a source of vicarious learned helplessness for viewers.

A content analysis of NBC and CBS newscasts confirmed that network news viewers see an inordinate amount of helplessness displayed; the presentation rather than the content made the element of helplessness prominent.[53]

It has been demonstrated experimentally that an unpleasant film can create a negative mood and also cause the viewer to see other people as less attractive than before.[54]

Even more to the point, a well-designed experiment found that a short radio newscast with four bad news items created a more depressed mood and caused the listeners to

evaluate other people more negatively.[39] A subsequent experiment tested the effects on actual behavior; again, those who heard a short bad news broadcast not only felt more depressed but were less likely to give assistance to another person needing help.[40] Both experiments were conducted in naturalistic real-life settings with the subjects unaware of the research purpose.

Summary of Effects. There is clear-cut experimental evidence that the immediate effects of even small doses of bad news can be negative—causing depressed mood, a jaundiced attitude toward other people and a reduction in actual helping behavior.

The long-term effects from prolonged exposure are less clear. It is known that many people have an affinity for negative information and are influenced more by negative than by equal amounts of positive information; that people generally prefer the worst rather than uncertainty; that some people acquire paranoid feelings after exposure to unpleasant information; that the carrier of a negative stimulus is himself perceived more negatively; that people tend to overestimate the more serious crimes; and that the number of suicides increases after news reports of suicides.

Correlation alone does not prove causation, though it is one of the requirements. More experimental research in naturalistic situations is needed to test the hypothesis indicated by available research, that prolonged exposure to bad news can have damaging effects on moods, attitudes toward people and institutions, social behavior and mental health.

Constructive Approaches to Bad News

Can alternative methods for presenting bad news be devised that are more socially responsible and beneficial than conventional approaches? Can such constructive approaches be just as acceptable to journalists and just as interesting to the public?

An experiment has shown that, while a film can increase aggressive behavior, a happy ending to the film will decrease the aggression effect.[41]

An experiment on titles for magazine articles has demonstrated that optimistic titles are more interesting than pessimistic titles, for articles that could be accurately titled either way.[42]

It seems paradoxical that while readers generally are more interested in bad news than other news, they are also more interested in optimistic than pessimistic titles. That paradox was resolved with a study which showed that "bad news with a constructive twist" is more interesting than straight bad news.[43]

A study of reader interest in "typical" newspaper headlines produced two categories or clusters of items called "Solutions for Social Problems" and "Solutions for Family Problems;" these "constructive approach" categories had higher reader interest ratings than three bad news factors or categories uncovered in the same study.[44]

Summary of Constructive Approaches. Items with happy endings, optimistic titles and problem solutions are almost invariably more interesting to the public than the same items without such positive approaches. The acceptability of such approaches to newsmen is unknown.

Summary and Conclusions

This review of psychological and communications research evidence on "the bad news problem" has produced some empirical support for the following hypotheses, though the evidence is quite spotty and needful of more research in every case:

1) *Definition.* The commonsense definition of bad news as "new information about unpleasant things or events" does have some empirical validation based on factor analysis of reader interest ratings. Bad news is not a unitary concept but comprises several distinctive sub-categories.

2) *Prevalence and Prominence.* Since 1950, the proportion of bad news in a variety of U.S. media, places and times seems remarkably stable, varying between 25 and 50% of total news space in print and broadcast media. On the average, roughly one-third of news space seems devoted to bad news and an equal amount to good news. There appear to be strong fluctuations in the ratio of bad to good news over time periods, and some evidence that good news may be most predominant in bad times.

American TV network news programs may be the heaviest dealers in bad news.

Bad news is more prominently displayed than other news in both newspapers and television—longer stories, more photographs and up-front placement.

3) *Media Accuracy.* Newsmagazines, newspapers and TV prime shows do not reflect the world of real events very faithfully. The more serious crimes are overrepresented in the media while certain other events are underrepresented. In addition, bad news is more likely to contain factual errors than good news.

4) *Journalists' News Values.* Editors' values and priorities are most validly reflected in the behavioral evidence already cited, namely the over-prevalence and over-prominence of bad news contained in the media. Given a choice, editors will select stories with more conflict over those that have less.

5) *Public Perception of Bad News.* "Too much bad news" is by far the leading public complaint about newspaper and TV news—71% endorse that statement. Basic psychological evidence on selective perception, plus the previous conclusion that only about one-third of the news is actually bad, lead to the conclusion that the public undoubtedly misperceives and overestimates the true amount.

6) *Public Interest in Bad News.* The general public can aptly be described as "bad news bears." Interest in bad news averages about one-fourth to one-third higher than for other kinds of news combined.

7) *The Audience for Bad News.* Not much hard evidence is available on the kinds of people who are attracted to bad news. In general, men have historically been more interested than women, but recent evidence indicates that young women may be more interested than young men.

There is indirect evidence and theory that lower intelligence and certain personality types may be

associated with high interest in bad news.

8) *Motives Behind Bad News Interest.* Nothing whatever is really known about this. However, there are some promising hunches, hypotheses and theories.

9) *Effects of Bad News.* In the short-run, there is solid evidence that even a short radio newscast can have several undesirable effects. The long-term effects can only be suspected. It is known that many people have an affinity for negative information and many are influenced more by negative than by positive information.

Psychiatrists are convinced, but short on evidence, that various sociocultural forces have a profound influence on mental and emotional health. The news must be considered a sociocultural force to be reckoned with.

10) *Constructive Approaches to Bad News.* A major purpose of this research is to determine if alternative approaches to the simplistic reporting of unpleasant events can be formulated, accepted by journalists, and interesting to the public.

The evidence shows that happy endings, optimistic titles and solutions to problems are almost invariably more interesting than the same items without such positive approaches.

The present evidence is only suggestive and not conclusive. A long-range many-faceted research program is needed to thoroughly explore all the questions that have been raised.

There is a place for all research methodologies in this approach—case studies, historical analysis, synthesis of research literature, content analysis, sample surveys, laboratory experiments and field experiments, to name the most evident.

NOTES

1. Ellen Bennett, "Factor Analysis of Stereotyped News Headlines." Unpublished report, University of Tennessee, 1979.
2. Charles Swanson, "What They Read in 130 Daily Newspapers," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1955, 32, 411-421.
3. Walter Gieber, "Do Newspapers Overplay Negative News?" *Journalism Quarterly*, 1955, 32, 311-318.
4. Guido H. Stempel, "Content Patterns of Small and Metropolitan Dailies," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1962, 39, 88-90.
5. Michael W. Singletary, "Newspaper Photographs: A Content Analysis," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1976, 55(3), 585-589.
6. Barbara W. Hartung and Gerald Stone, "Time to Stop Singing the 'Bad News' Blues," *Newspaper Research Journal*, 1980, 1(2), 19-26.
7. Dennis T. Lowry, "Gresham's Law and Network TV News Selection," *Journal of Broadcasting*, 1971, 15, 397-408.
8. Benjamin D. Singer, "Violence, Protest and War in Television News: The U.S. and Canada Compared," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1970, 34, 611-616.
9. Richard Lindeborg and Gerald Stone, "News Values as Reflected in Newspaper Content Found Stable from 1950 Through 1970," *ANPA News Research Bulletin No. 7*, Nov. 13, 1974, 1-5.
10. George E. Everett, "Trends in Front Page Bad News, 1893-1973: A Pilot Study." Unpublished paper, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, November 1979.
11. Swanson, *op. cit.*
12. Daphne Shepherd and B. M. Barraclough, "Suicide Reporting: Information or Entertainment?" *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 1978, 132, 283-287.
13. Gerald Stone and Barbara W. Hartung, "Good News vs. Bad: A Relative Impact Investigation." Paper presented at Association for Education in Journalism Convention, Houston, August, 1979.
14. Lowry, *op. cit.*
15. Singer, *op. cit.*
16. Joseph R. Dominick, "Crime and Law-Enforcement on Prime Time Television," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1973, 37, 241-250.
17. G. Ray Funkhouser, "Trends in Media Coverage of the Issues of the Sixties," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1973, 50, 533-538.
18. James F. Davis, "Crime News in Colorado Newspapers," *American Journal of Sociology*, 1951, 57, 325-330.
19. George E. Antunes and P. A. Hurley, "The Representation of Criminal Events in Houston's Two Daily Newspapers," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1977, 54 (4), 756-760.
20. Michael Singletary, "Accuracy in News Reporting, A Review of the Research," *ANPA News Research Bulletin* No. 25, Jan. 25, 1980.
21. I. S. Pool and Irwin Shulman, "Newsmen's Fantasies, Audiences and Newswriting," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1959, 23, 145-158.
22. Abraham Tesser and Sidney Rosen, "The Reluctance to Transmit Bad News." In L. Berkowitz, (editor), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 8, (New York: Academic Press, 1975).
23. L. Erwin Atwood and Gerald L. Grotta, "Socialization of News Values in Beginning Reporters," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1973, 50, 759-761.
24. Robert W. Clyde and J. K. Buckalew, "Inter-media Standardization: A Q-analysis of News Editors," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1969, 46, 349-351.
25. Walter J. Ward, "News Values, News Situations and News Selections: An Intensive Study of 10 City Editors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.
26. Sophia Peterson, "Foreign News Gatekeepers and Criteria of Newsworthiness," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1979, 56(1), 116-125.
27. T. P. Petzel and E. J. Michaels, "Perception of Violence as a Function of Levels of Hostility," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1973, 41, 35-36.
28. George Gerbner and L. Gross, "Violence Profile No. 6: Trends in Network Television Drama and Viewer Conceptions of Social Reality, 1967-1973," (Philadelphia: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, Monograph, 1974).
29. Davis, *op. cit.*
30. Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. "Tracking the Attitudes of the Public Toward the Newspaper Business," *ANPA News Research Report No. 19*, April 20, 1979.
31. Jack B. Haskins, "What We Know About Bad News." In *Proceedings, Third Annual Communications Research Symposium*, Joseph McKerns (editor), Knoxville: University of Tennessee Communications Research Center, April, 1980.
32. Swanson, *op. cit.*
33. Jack B. Haskins, "Stories of Violence Get High Readership," *Editor and Publisher*, Oct. 19, 1968, p.38.
34. Peter Clarke, "Does Teen News Attract Boys to Newspapers?" *Journalism Quarterly*, 1968, 45, 7-13.
35. David H. Weaver and John B. Mauro, "Newspaper Readership Patterns," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1978, 55(1), 84-91.
36. Robert L. Stevenson, "Readership of the High Point Enterprise," (School of Journalism, University of North Carolina, 1977).
37. Robert L. Stevenson, "Newspaper Readership and Community Ties," *ANPA News Research Report No. 18*, March 9, 1979.
38. Jack B. Haskins, "Knoxville Newspaper Opinion Survey." Proprietary research report, Knoxville, 1978.
39. Robert W. Clyde, "News Readership as a Function of Several Affective Characteristics," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1968, 45, 535-537.
40. Bennett, *op. cit.*
41. Jack B. Haskins, "'Cloud with a Silver Lining' Approach to Violence News," *Journalism Quarterly*, 1973, 50(3), 549-552.
42. Ruth Clark, *Changing Needs of Changing Readers*, (New York: Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc.), May, 1979.
43. Swanson, *op. cit.*
44. Stevenson, 1977; *op. cit.*
45. John B. Mauro and David H. Weaver, "Patterns of Newspaper Readership," *ANPA News Research Report No. 4*, July 1977, 1-4.
46. H. J. Eysenck, "Personality and the

Law of Effect." In D. E. Berlyne and K. B. Madsen, (editors), *Pleasure, Reward and Preference*. (New York: Academic Press, 1973), 133-166.

47. Charles B. Schultz, "The Effect of Confidence on Selective Exposure: An Unresolved Dilemma," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 1974, 94 (1), 64-69.

48. Joseph J. Locascio and C. R. Snyder, "Selective Attention to Threatening Stimuli and Field Independence as Factors in the Etiology of Paranoid Behavior," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 1975, 84(6), 637-643.

49. John S. Strauss, "Social and Cultural Influences on Psychopathology," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 1979, 30, 398-415.

50. M. H. Richel, et al., "Relative Influence of Positive and Negative Information in Impression Formation and Persistence," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1967, 6, 322-327.

51. Lawrence A. Pervin, "The Need to Predict and Control Under Conditions of Threat," *Journal of Personality*, 1963, 31, 570-587.

52. Locascio and Snyder, *op. cit.*

53. A. J. Lott and B. E. Lott, "A Learning Theory Approach to Interpersonal Attitudes." In A. G. Greenwald, T. C. Brock and T. M. Ostrom (Eds.) *Psychological Foundations of Attitudes*. (New York: Academic Press, 1968), 67-88.

54. Antunes and Hurley, *op. cit.*

55. B. Barraclough, D. Shepherd, and C. Jennings, "Do Newspaper Reports of Coroners' Inquests Incite People to Commit Suicide?" *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 1977, 131, 528-532.

56. David P. Phillips, "Suicide, Motor Vehicle Fatalities, and the Mass Media: Evidence Toward a Theory of Suggestion," *American Journal of Sociology*, 1979, 84(5), 1150-1174.

57. Grace Ferrari Levine, "Learned Helplessness and the Evening News," *Journal of Communications*, 1977, 27(4), 100-103.

58. Charles Gouas, "Induced Affective States and Interpersonal Attraction," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1971, 20(1), 37-43.

59. Russell Veitch and William Griffitt, "Good News-Bad News" Affective and Interpersonal Effects," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 1976, 6(1), 69-75.

60. Russell Veitch, Robert Dewood and Kathy Bosko, "Radio News Broadcasts: Their Effects on Interpersonal Helping," *Sociometry*, 1977, 40(4), 383-386.

61. D. Zillman, R. C. Johnson, and J. Hanrahan, "Pacifying Effect of Happy Ending of Communications Involving Aggression," *Psychological Reports*, 1974, 32, 967-970.

62. Curtis Publishing Company, "An Experiment on Optimistic vs. Pessimistic Titles," (Philadelphia: Development Research Division, Curtis Publishing Co., undated, circa 1960).

63. Haskins, 1973, *op. cit.*

64. Bennett, *op. cit.*